

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are currently pending in the application. Claim 1 is independent.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the remarks set forth herein. Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration thereof in light of the comments contained herein, and earnestly seeks timely allowance of the pending claims.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being made obvious by US 5,604,549 ("Mashige et al.") alone or alternatively in view of US 6,008,904 ("Ishii et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner has the burden of meeting the basic criterion that the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Regarding this basic criterion, the Applicant submits that Mashige, Ishii and any combination thereof (assuming the references may be combined, which Applicant does not admit) do not disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1, as explained in detail below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Mashige discloses at col. 10 lines 16-22 the step of designing a second temporary optical device (page 3, lines 15-17 of the Office Action).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites that A) a second temporary optical device for optimizing a form is designed based on correction wavefront aberration amounts, and then B) a normal molding die is designed according to the optimized form of the second temporary optical device, for molding a normal optical device. Mashige merely discloses calculating a certain deviation value and correcting faces 16b and 18b of the upper and lower mold members 16 and 18 (see col. 10, lines 14-32 of Mashige). In other words, Mashige is completely silent about newly designing a second temporary optical device different from a firstly molded temporary optical device, before designing a normal molding die. Thus, Mashige does not design a second temporary optical device before designing a normal molding die

according to the optimized form of such second temporary optical device, for molding a normal optical device.

The Examiner also alleged in the Office Action that Ishii teaches that interferometers are used to measure a plurality of wavefront aberrations (page 3, lines 20-22 of Office Action). However, Ishii merely discloses improving measurement precision of an optical wavefront aberration-measuring apparatus (col. 7, lines 32-35). Further, Ishii merely discloses that wavefront aberrations are reduced (col. 7, lines 45-46). Ishii is completely silent about calculating a plurality of wavefront aberration amounts Δi for a plurality of divided wavefront areas, as claim 1 recites.

Thus, Mashige and Ishii do not disclose or suggest the sequence of steps in claim 1, including, at least, “measuring a wavefront of thus molded first temporary optical device and calculating a plurality of wavefront aberration amounts Δi for a plurality of divided wavefront areas [...] designing a second temporary optical device for optimizing a form so as to exhibit a wavefront aberration with the correction wavefront aberration amounts $-\Delta i$ [...] and designing, according to the optimized form of the second temporary optical device, a normal molding die for molding a normal optical device.”

In view of the above, claims 1-3 and 5-7 are patentable over Mashige and Ishii. The allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-7 is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above. Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Corina E. Tanasa, Registration No. 64,042, at telephone number (703) 208-4003, located in the Washington, DC area, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: December 16, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Attorney for Applicant